Ronald Wilcox, Esq., State Bar No. 176601 2160 The Alameda, Suite F, First Floor	
San Jose, CA 95126	
ronaldwilcox@post.harvard.edu	
Peter F. Barry, Esq., 0266577 (Admitted Pro Ha	ac Vice)
2021 E. Hennepin Are, #195	
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55413 Tel: (612) 379-8800	
Fax: (612) 379-8810	
pbarry@lawpoint.com	
ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFFS	
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
	TRICT OF CALIFORNIA OSE DIVISION
WELLS,	CIV. NO. C 06-03511 RMW HRL
Plaintiffs,	NOTICE AND MOTION TO ENFORCE SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT AND
v. )	[PROPOSED] ORDER
GC SERVICES LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, )	Date: April 25, 2008
)	Time: 9:00 a.m. HON. RONALD M WHYTE
Defendant.	U.S. District Court
	280 South 1 <sup>st</sup> St., San Jose, CA
PLEASE TAKE NOTICE THAT on April 25, 2008, at 9:00 a.m., or as soon thereafter as the	
matter may be heard, in the above-entitled Court located at 280 South 1st St., San Jose, CA 95113,	
Plaintiffs will move the court to Enforce the Settlement Agreement entered into at the Settlement	
Conference with Hon. Howard Lloyd. This motion will be based on the herein notice and motion,	
including the legal authorities cited, the supporting declaration, all documents related to the motion, all	
documents in the Court's file in this action, all matters of which the Court may take judicial notice, and	
any other items the Court deems appropriate.	
	- 1 -
	2160 The Alameda, Suite F, First Floor San Jose, CA 95126 Tel: (408) 296-0400 Fax: (408) 296-0486 ronaldwilcox@post.harvard.edu  Peter F. Barry, Esq., 0266577 (Admitted Pro Ha Barry & Slade, LLC 2021 E. Hennepin Are, #195 Minneapolis, Minnesota 55413 Tel: (612) 379-8800 Fax: (612) 379-8810 pbarry@lawpoint.com  ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFFS  UNITED STATT NORTHERN DIST SAN JC  CATHERINE WELLS and CLARENCE  WELLS,  Plaintiffs,  v.  GC SERVICES LIMITED PARTNERSHIP,  Defendant.  PLEASE TAKE NOTICE THAT on A matter may be heard, in the above-entitled Cour Plaintiffs will move the court to Enforce the Set Conference with Hon. Howard Lloyd. This modincluding the legal authorities cited, the support documents in the Court's file in this action, all recommends.

## 1. BACKGROUND

With the assistance of Hon. Howard Lloyd, the parties resolved this matter at a Settlement Conference on February 11, 2008. The parties placed the terms of settlement on the record, agreed the Defendant must take action to complete the settlement by March 12, 2008. The parties also agreed this court would retain jurisdiction to enforce the terms of the settlement agreement. See Declaration of Ronald Wilcox in Support of Motion to Enforce Settlement Agreement (hereafter "Wilcox Decl."), ¶1.

The Hon. Ronald M. Whyte set a Case Management Conference for March 14, 2008. When Defendants failed to complete the settlement, Plaintiffs filed a request to Continue the March 14, 2008 CMC, to allow Defendant more time to honor the settlement terms. The Hon. Ronald M. Whyte continued the March 14, 2008 CMC to March 28, 2008 (Doc# 113), indicating there would be no further continuances. *Wilcox Decl.*, ¶2.

Defendant had thirty days to complete the settlement. However, Defendant has breached the terms of settlement and has failed to complete the settlement. Plaintiffs met and conferred with Defendant in an effort to resolve this matter, including phone calls on March 19, 2008 to Defendant's counsel and the insurance carrier, and several e-mails. In an email dated March 19, 2008, Defendant wrote, "ACE's check is in the mail..." However, as of the time of this writing Defendant is still in breach, the settlement was to be concluded by March 12, 2008, and the court had indicated it would not allow any further continuances of the CMC. Plaintiffs were forced to file this motion. *Wilcox Decl.*, ¶3.

Plaintiffs respectfully request: 1) an order enforcing the terms of the settlement agreement, and requiring Defendant to complete the terms of the settlement agreement immediately, and 2) an order awarding Plaintiffs their attorney's fees and costs (\$1,300) for having to enforce the terms of the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Plaintiffs have ordered a copy of the recording of the settlement terms placed on the record.

1 2

settlement agreement.

3

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

26

27 28

3. **RELIEF REQUESTED** 

2. **ARGUMENT** 

In making the decision to enforce a settlement agreement, a district court must conclude that the parties have reached an agreement on all material terms. Brock v. Scheuner Corp., 841 F.2d 151, 154 (6th Cir. 1988). Where facts material to an agreement are in dispute, an evidentiary hearing is generally compulsory. RE/MAX Int'l, Inc. v. Realty One, Inc., 271 F.3d 633, 646 (6th Cir. 2001) citing Kukla v. Nat'l Distillers Prods. Co., 483 F.2d 619, 622 (6th Cir. 1973)). However, no evidentiary hearing is required where an agreement is clear and unambiguous and no issue of fact is present. Aro Corp. v. Allied Witan Co., 531 F.2d 1368, 1372 (6th Cir. 1976). Thus, summary enforcement of a settlement agreement, as in this case, is appropriate when there is no substantial dispute regarding the existence of the agreement and the terms are unambiguous. Kukla, 483 F.2d at 621; Aro Corp., 531 F.2d at 1372.

Herein, the parties do not dispute an agreement was reached. Indeed, Judge Lloyd's minute order clearly states, "Settlement Conference Held. Case settled. Terms are confidential." Doc# 110. Simply put, Defendant is in breach, and Plaintiffs have been forced to file this motion.

Furthermore, Plaintiffs brought claims under the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, which contains a fee shifting provision, thus providing reasonable attorney's fees and costs. 15 U.S.C. 1692k. Therefore, Plaintiffs are entitled to all reasonable fees and costs incurred herein. Nunez v. Interstate Corporate Systems, Inc., 799 P.2d 30 (Supreme Court of Arizona 1990) ("The award of attorney fees was required under 15 U.S.C.S. § 1692k(a)(3) because it provided statutory authority not only to award fees in the initial action but also in any action, such as this one, to enforce the judgment obtained in that initial action."). Also see, In re Nucorp Energy, 764 F.2d 655 (9th Cir. 1985) and Spain v. Montanos, 690 F.2d 742 (9th Cr. 1982).

## 

1	Plaintiffs respectfully requests:
2	1) an order enforcing the terms of the settlement agreement, and requiring Defendant to complete the
3	terms of the settlement agreement immediately,
4	2) an order awarding Plaintiffs' counsel Ronald Wilcox attorney's fees and costs for having to enforce
5	the terms of the settlement agreement (the amount to date is \$1,300),
6	
7 8	Respectfully submitted,
9	
	Dated: 3/21/08
10 11	/s/Ronald Wilcox Ronald Wilcox, Counsel for Plaintiffs
12	
13	
14	[PROPOSED] ORDER
15	Defendant is hereby ordered to complete the terms of the settlement agreement that were placed
16	on the record with the Hon. Howard Lloyd on February 11, 2008, without delay.
17	Defendant is also ordered to reimburse Plaintiffs' counsel Ronald Wilcox \$1,300 for the
18	attorney's fees expended relating to Defendant's breach.
19	IT IS SO ORDERED.
20	
21	Date:
22	
23	HON. RONALD M. WHYTE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	